

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In this Response, Claims 1, 9, 11, 16, 39 and 40 are cancelled and Claims 2-8, 10, 12-15, 17-25, and 30 have been amended to change their dependency. Further Claim 38 has been amended to include the feature originally recited in original Claim 39. Support for these Claims amendments is found throughout the specification and the originally filed Claims. Accordingly, the amendments do not introduce any new matter.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-10, 26 and 30 as allegedly being indefinite or failing to particularly point out and distinctly Claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Examiner states that the term “substantially larger” in Claim 1 is unclear. Although Applicants believe that the term “substantially larger” as recited in Claim 1 is clear and further supported by the original specification, Applicants have cancelled independent Claim 1 to expedite prosecution of this application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of the cancelled Claims in another application. Further, dependent Claims 2-10, 26 and 30 have been amended to directly or indirectly depend from Claim 34, which Examiner indicated is allowable. Accordingly, the rejection to 35 U.S.C. § 112 has been overcome.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

In the Final Office Action dated August 14, 2006, the Examiner indicates that independent Claims 31-37 and 41 are allowable and that dependent Claims 9, 16, 22, 25, and 39 would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base Claim and any intervening Claims.

Applicants have cancelled Claims 1 and 9, and further amended dependent claims 2-8, 10, 26-27 and 30 to be dependent from allowable independent Claim 34. Further, Applicants cancelled Claims 11 and 16, and amended dependent claims 12-15, 17-25, 28-29 to be dependent from allowable independent Claim 35.

Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments to the Claims overcome the rejection set forth in the previous Office Action and thus are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully requests that this Amendment After Final be entered by the Examiner in the interest of expediting prosecution and placing the application in better form for allowance or appeal, if necessary.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that this Amendment After Final and the accompanying remarks do not raise new issues for consideration or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner. This Amendment After Final should therefore allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Applicants also submit that entry of this Amendment After Final and the accompanying remarks would place the present application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of any of the pending Claims.

On the basis of the foregoing Amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the Claims 2-8, 10, 12-15, 17-38 and 41 of the present application are allowable over the prior art of record. Applicants thus respectfully request the previous rejections be withdrawn, and that the pending Claims be allowed by the Examiner. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12/14/06

By: Lisa A. Chiarini

Lisa A. Chiarini
Reg No. 50,932

Gary M. Butter
Reg. No. 33,841

Attorney for Applicant(s)
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
30 Rockefeller Plaza, 44th floor
New York, New York 10112-0228
(212) 408-2646